Library of

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY

BRIGHTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Vol. VIII. ST. LOUIS, MO., THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1901. No. 17.

The Review

Founded, Edited, and Published by Arthur Preuss.

Published Weekly at $2. a Year (Foreign $2.50.) Office: 13 N. 3rd Street. Telephone, Bridge 246A.

[Entered at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., as Second Class Matter in August 1896.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	Page
The "Americanism" Which Leo XIII. has Condemned. (Rev. Dr. Chas. Maignen.)	257
Subjects of the Day:	
Protestant Proselytizing in Italy. (J. F. M.)—A Courageous Bishop. (J. F. M.)—Much Loot and no Ethics.	265
With Our Exchanges. (Arthur Preuss.)	267
Notes and Remarks.	268
Current Educational Topics: Notes,	272
Booklist.	272
The Religious World: Notes,	272

THE "AMERICANISM" WHICH LEO XIII. HAS CONDEMNED.

RÉSUMÉ OF A RECENT CONTROVERSY, WITH SOME NEW SIDELIGHTS.

By the Rev. Chas. Maignen, D. D., Author of 'Father Hecker: Is He a Saint?' etc.

IV.

We shall now deal no longer with the principles underlying "Americanism," but with the thing itself, the formulas it makes use of, and the ends it aims to reach.

Father Elliott ('Life of Father Hecker,' page 394), condensing Father Hecker's thought as explained in 'An Exposition of the Church,' etc., speaks of "the hopeless failure of the post-Reformation methods to meet the needs of the hour; and especially the Vatican decrees, which have set at rest all controversy on authority among Catholics;" and declares that—

> The needs of the times, therefore, call for virtues among Catholics which shall display the personal force of Catholic life no less than that which is organic. These must all centre around the cultivation of the Holy Spirit in the individual soul.

This idea of Father Hecker, which is frequently repeated in the writings of his followers, Leo XIII. rejects absolutely. He thinks it even more injurious to the Church than the proposition censured by Pius VI.

> But in the matter of which we are now speaking, Beloved Son, the project involves a greater danger and is more hostile to Catholic doctrine and discipline, in as much as the followers of these novelties judge that a certain liberty ought to be introduced into the Church, so that, limiting the exercise and vigilance of its powers, each one of the faithful may act more freely in pursuance of his own natural bent and capacity. They affirm, namely, that this is called for in order to imitate that liberty which, though quite recently introduced, is now the law and foundation of almost every civil community.

As the Holy Father had treated extensively

of this error in his Encyclical on the Constitution of States, he did not judge it necessary to do it here again; but he deems it important to note particularly an assertion frequently made by the partisans of "Americanism."

Msgr. Ireland, in his introduction (page XV) says:

> There have been epochs in history where the Church, sacrificing her outposts and ranks of her skirmishers to the preservation of central and vital fortresses, put the brakes, through necessity, from the nature of the warfare waged against her, upon individual activity, and moved her soldiers in serried masses, and then it was the part and glory of each one to move with the column. The need of repression has passed away. The authority of the Church and of her Supreme Head is beyond danger of being denied or obscured, and each Christian soldier must take to the field, obeying the breathing of the Spirit of truth and piety within him, feeling that what he may do he should do.

This historic view was familiar to Father Hecker. We find it also in the writings of Dufresne, Klein, and many others. But Leo judges differently. He says:

> It is of importance, therefore, to note particularly an opinion, which is adduced as a sort of argument to urge the granting of such liberty to Catholics. For they say, in speaking of the infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff, that after the solemn decision formulated in the Vatican Council, there is no more need of solicitude in that regard, and, because of its being now out of dispute, a wider field of thought and action is thrown open to individuals. A preposterous method of arguing, surely. For if anything is suggested by the infallible teaching of the Church, it is certainly that no one should wish to withdraw from it, nay, that all should strive to be thoroughly imbued with it, and be guided by its spirit, so as to be the more easily preserved from any private error whatsoever. To this we may add that those who argue in that wise quite set aside the wisdom and providence of God; Who when He desired in that very solemn decision to affirm the authority and teaching office of the Holy Apostolic See, desired it especially in order the more efficaciously to guard the minds of Catholics from the dangers of the present times. The license which is commonly confounded with liberty, the passion for saying and reviling everything, the habit of thinking and expressing everything in print, have cast such deep shadows on men's minds, that there is now greater utility and necessity for this office than ever before, lest men should be drawn away from conscience and duty.

That lesson, given with as much eloquence as authority, ought to inspire the "innovators" with more reserve in their bird's-eye views of the past, the present, and the future of the Church.

The questions taken up by the Holy Father in the subsequent part of his letter are presented as corollaries from the preceding opinions. They are, indeed, more limited and are not equally professed by all, nor with the same vehemence.

The idea of individual inspiration and conscious direction by the Holy Ghost, is rather personal to Father Hecker and his two biographers, Elliott and Klein:

> The increased action of the Holy Spirit, with a more vigorous coöperation on the part of the faithful, which is in process of realisation, will elevate the human personality to an intensity of force and grandeur productive of a new era in the Church and to society, an era difficult for the imagina- to grasp and still more difficult to describe in words, unless we have recourse to the prophetic language of the inspired scriptures. ('Life', pages 395-96.)

This theory that a more abundant effusion of the Holy Ghost is in store for the Church in the future, is severely censured by the Pope:

> For in the first place, all external guidance is rejected as superfluous, nay even as somewhat of a disadvantage for those who desire to devote themselves to the acquisition of Christian perfection; for the Holy Ghost, they say, pours greater and richer gifts into the hearts of the faithful now than in times past; and by a certain hidden instinct teaches and moves them with no one as an intermediary. It is, indeed, not a little rash to wish to determine the degree in which God communicates with men, for that depends solely on His will; and He Himself is the absolutely free giver of His own gifts. The Spirit breatheth where He will (John III. 8.) But to every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the giving of Christ (Eph. IV. 7.) For who,

when going over the history of the Apostles, the faith of the rising Church, the struggles and slaughters of the valiant martyrs, and finally most of the ages past so abundantly rich in holy men, will presume to compare the past with the present times and to assert that they received a lesser outpouring of the Holy Ghost?

Then, in splendid language, Leo goes on recalling the Catholic teaching on the necessity of the light and inspiration of the Holy Ghost in the working-out of our salvation, and on the rôle of outward direction in the guidance of souls.

While this doctrine of Father Hecker was not espoused by those "Americanists" whose aims lie in the political order or in the field of ecclesiastical polity, it gained for "Americanism" the sympathy of a great many prominent Protestants. During the whole discussion, in 1898, the Protestant press never ceased to encourage "Americanism," hoping that it would bring about what it pleased to call a reform within Catholicism.

V.

Let us now take up another batch of errors.

For one who examines the matter thoroughly, says Leo XIII., it is hard to see, if we do away with all external guidance, as these innovators propose, what purpose the more abundant influence of the Holy Ghost, which they make so much of, is to serve. In point of fact, it is especially in the cultivation of virtues that the assistance of the Holy Ghost is indispensable: but those who affect these novelties extol beyond measure the natural virtues as more in accordance with the ways and requirements of the present day, and consider it an advantage to be richly endowed with them, because they make a man more ready and more strenuous in action.

These words of the Apostolic letter seem to be directed against a passage from the introduction to the 'Life of Father Hecker,' where Msgr. Ireland says:

> Newman writes that where the sun shines bright in the warm climates of the South, the natives know little of safeguards against cold and wet. They have their cold days, but only now and then; and they do not deem it worth while to provide against them; the science of calefaction is reserved to the North. And so, Protestants, depending on human means solely, are led to make the most of them; their sole resource is to use what they have; they are the anxious cultivators of the rugged soil. Catholics, on the contrary, feel that God will protect the Church, and, as Newman adds, "we sometimes forget that we shall please him best, and get most from Him, when, according to the fable, we put our shoulder to the wheel, when we use what we have by nature to the utmost, at the same time that we look out for what is beyond nature in the confidence of faith and hope" (page XIII. sq.)

The writer of the introduction evidently confounds two very different things, the natural means and the natural virtues. That makes him say in an other place (page XII.):

> And natural virtues practised in the proper frame of mind and heart, become supernatural. Each century calls for its type of Christian perfection. At one time it was martyrdom; at another, it was the humility of the cloister. To-day we need the Christian gentleman and the Christian citizen. An honest ballot and social decorum among Catholics will do more for God's glory and the salvation of souls than midnight flagellations or Compostellan pilgrimages.

Leo XIII. declares:

> It is hard to understand how those who are imbued with Christian principles can place the natural ahead of the supernatural virtues, and attribute to them greater power and fecundity. Is nature, then, with grace added to it, weaker than when left to its own strength? and have the eminently holy men, whom the Church reveres and pays homage to, shown themselves weak and incompetent in the natural order, because they have excelled in Christian virtue?

And in a magnificent exposé the Holy Father reminds us of the necessity of grace even in the observance of the purely natural law, and the worthlessness, for Heaven, of acts performed without heavenly aid. With equal vigor he rejects the assertion that "each century calls for its type of Christian perfection." He says:

> The one who would have Christian virtues to be adapted, some to one age and others to another, has forgotten the words of the Apostle: "Whom He foreknew, He also predestined to be made conformable to the image of His Son" (Rom. VIII. 29). The Master and exemplar of all sanctity is

Christ, to Whose rule all must conform who wish to attain to the thrones of the blessed. Now, then, Christ does not at all change with the progress of the ages, but is "yesterday and to-day and the same forever" (Hebr. XIII. 8.) To the men of all ages the phrase is to be applied: "Learn of me because I am meek and humble of heart" (Matt. XI. 29) and at all times Christ shows Himself to us as becoming "obedient unto death" (Philip. II. 8), and in every age also the word of the Apostle holds: "and they that are Christ's have crucified their flesh with the vices and concupiscences" (Gal. V. 24.) Would that more would cultivate those virtues in our days, as did the holy men of by-gone times! Those who by humbleness of spirit, by obedience and abstinence, were powerful in word and work, were of the greatest help not only to religion but to the State and society.

This mania of "adapting" everything to the "wants of the age," which Leo denounced in the beginning of his letter as the fundamental fallacy of "Americanism," was extended by the "innovators" to the whole domain of spiritual life, only a few weeks after the publication of the French Life of Father Hecker,*) when the Abbé Naudet undertook, in the *Justice Sociale*, to vindicate the cardinal virtues of fortitude, justice, prudence, and temperance at the expense of obedience and humility.

> Were we to be found a heretic, he wrote, we believe these virtues superior to humility and obedience, and we ought to hear about them sometimes.

And, forecasting the objection drawn from tradition and the Fathers, the Abbé Naudet added:

> Naturally they will object to us those numerous texts, arranged in battle-array, pretending to crush us, but that affects us very little, even not at all, and we persist in believing that on this point a change is needed in our spirituality.

And pushing his conclusions still farther, the editor of *La Justice Sociale* says of the 'Following of Christ,' by Thomas a Kempis:

> From this viewpoint one might ask, whether the 'Following of Christ' has as happy an influence on the souls of our epoch as is asserted by some. Naturally some will cry, You blaspheme, and will tell us: "It is the most beautiful book that has come from human hands, because, etc." But that is not enough to convince us. We believe that this book—very beautiful, in many passages full of a fine and deep psychology, carries the annihilation of the human personality too far, and that a collection of maxims, gathered or composed by a monk of the XIV. century for other monks, can not be the book for a society that has nothing of monasticism in its education, mind, or attitude. For our part we have met with souls that could not accommodate themselves to it.

These reflections—which their author at present must be regretting—were the fruit of a recent perusal of the 'Life of Father Hecker.' It is, indeed, Father Hecker who, by naming them "passive," has brought into bad repute those virtues which are the foundation of every spiritual edifice. He held that for our times a new ideal of Christian perfection is wanted, an opinion which, as we have seen, was condemned by Leo XIII.

On page 393 of Elliott's 'Life of Father Hecker' we read:

> The passive virtues, fostered under an overruling Providence for the defence of threatened external authority in religion, and producing admirable effects of uniformity, discipline, and obedience, served well in the politics of the Reformation and post-Reformation eras, when nearly all governments were absolute monarchies; but the present governments are republics or constitutional monarchies, and are supposed to be ruled by the citizens themselves. This demands individual initiative, active personal exertion, and direct interference in public affairs. Vigilant and courageous voters rule the nations. Therefore, without injury to entire obedience, the active virtues in both the natural and supernatural orders must be mainly cultivated; in the first order everything that makes for self-reliance, and in the second the interior guidance of the Holy Spirit in the individual soul.

Leo XIII. was not slow to refute this theory. The testimony of St. Thomas Aquinas, the interpreter of reason and common sense, was enough for him to repel the innovation. He says:

> With this opinion about the natural virtues, another is intimately connected, according to which all Christian virtues are

*) The French Life appeared in June, the article by Naudet in July of the same year, 1897.

divided, as it were, into two classes, passive, as they say, and active; and they add, the former were better suited for the past times, but the latter are more in keeping with the present. It is plain what is to be thought of such division of the virtues.

Leo XIII. then touches upon another subject, that is related to one of the most widely spread errors of "Americanism." He is careful to notify us that this error is common to all "innovators." He says:

> From this species of contempt of the evangelical virtues, which are wrongly called passive, it naturally follows that the mind is naturally imbued little by little with a feeling of disdain for the religious life. And that this is common to the advocates of these new opinions, we gather from certain expressions of theirs about the vows which religious orders pronounce. For they say that such vows are altogether out of keeping with the spirit of our age, in as much as they narrow the limits of human liberty; are better adapted to weak minds than to strong ones; avail little for Christian perfection and the good of human society, and rather obstruct and interfere with it.

Indeed, in the 'Life of Father Hecker,' page 300, we read:

> With regard to stability, men of stable character need no vow to guarantee adherance to a divine vocation, and men of feeble character may indeed vow themselves into an outward stability, but it is of little fruit to themselves personally, and their irremovability is often of infinite distress to their superiors and brethren.

What a consolation for all religious to see the Pope so eager in their defense against the "innovators." Both the practice and doctrine of the Church readily manifest the falsity of such language, for she has always held the religious life in high esteem. And rightly so, for those who, called by God, embrace this kind of life, are not content with the common duties that the commandments impose, but bind themselves to the practice of the counsels, and thus become the élite of Christ's army. Can any one believe that is a sign of pusilanimity? or, perhaps, a practice useless or hurtful to perfection? Those that bind themselves by vows are far from losing their liberty; on the contrary, they enjoy it in its fulness, they possess that very liberty "whereby Christ has made us free."

This question of religious vows was not simply a theory for Father Hecker and his companions. As is well known, they left the order of the Most Holy Redeemer with the purpose of founding, not a new order, but a society of priests, called Paulists, who did not wish to be bound by any vow.

They had a right to do it, and no one would have found fault with their plan, had not their panegyrists gone beyond all measure.

In his introduction, Msgr. Ireland wrote:

> Father Hecker organised the Paulist community, and did in his way a great work for the conversion of the country. He made no mistake when he planned for a body of priests, more disciplined than usually are the parochial clergy, and more subtle in the character of their institute than the existing religious orders (page XVI.)

These last lines mean two things: that the Paulists have an advantage over the religious orders by having no vows, and that these orders themselves are in the way of transformation. Hence the salutary advice that Leo XIII. addresses to the Paulists and their friends towards the end of his letter:

> If there are any, therefore, who prefer to unite together in one society without the obligation of vows, let them do so as they desire. That is no new institution in the Church, nor is it to be disapproved. But let them beware of setting such association above religious orders; nay rather, since mankind is more prone than heretofore to enjoyment of pleasures, much greater esteem is to be accorded to those who have left all things and followed Christ.

VI.

These are the principal lessons addressed by the Holy See to the episcopate of the U. S. Prepared and provoked by a controversy of a year's duration, announced a long time in advance, impatiently expected, they received at once the formal assent of all who had in any way been mixed up in the debate.

Msgr. Ireland, who, as we have seen, was very prominent among the admirers of the Paulist founder, and who arrived in Rome but a few days after the Apostolic letter had been sent to Cardinal Gibbons, submitted at once to the

decision of the Holy See. "Having just finished reading the Brief of your Holiness," is the exordium of his letter, and he continues:

> In view of the surprising confusion of ideas and the bitter controversies raised especially in France, about the 'Life of Father Hecker'—the extent of which the Apostolic letter allows me to measure—it was, I can not help seeing it, a necessity for the chief pastor to make his voice heard, in order to enlighten and pacify the minds.

These latter words allude to the repeated efforts made to prevail upon the Holy Father that the letter to Cardinal Gibbons be not published. Being now enlightened about a danger that he declared he had not seen before, Msgr. Ireland repudiates the errors which "some have tried to cover by the name of 'Americanism.'"

> Certainly, with all the energy of my soul, I repudiate and condemn all the opinions which the Apostolic letter repudiates and condemns—all those false and dangerous opinions to which, as the letter states, certain persons have given the name of Americanism. I repudiate and condemn these opinions without exception, literally so as your Holiness repudiates and condemns them, and I repudiate and condemn them so much the more eagerly and heartily as never my Catholic faith and my understanding of Holy Church's teachings and practices allowed me to open my soul to such extravagances. All the bishops of the U. U., in their own name and in that of their flocks, are ready to repudiate and condemn these errors. We can not help feeling indignant that such an injury was inflicted upon us bishops and faithful, and our whole nation, as to designate by the word Americanism, as some did, errors and extravagances of this kind.

After the testimony adduced in this article, the reader has a right to be astonished at seeing Msgr. Ireland attribute the invention of the word "Americanism" to "the enemies of the Church of America."

The same note, although somewhat weakened, is found in the letters of submission addressed to the Holy Father by Msgr. Keane, the Abbé Felix Klein, and the Superior of the Paulists, Rev. P. Deshon. If we were to take in their strict sense certain assertions contained in these letters, and still more in the commentaries of a certain press, we should have to conclude that either the Pope found it handier to address warnings and councils which in reality concerned only the translators and commentators of the French 'Life of Father Hecker,' to the American bishops, or that the errors condemned by Leo XIII. were maintained nowhere. In an article of the *Quinzaine* (April 1st, 1899*), M. Fonsegrive rightly characterised these suppositions as injurious to the Holy See, but he added another that is quite new in theology:

> The noise made about the criticisms of the 'Life of Father Hecker' has given these criticisms the social radiation necessary to afford to the exercise of the teaching office such an opportunity as to make that exercise almost inevitable.

Hence, the errors condemned by the Holy Father were neither in the 'Life of Isaac Thomas Hecker,' nor in America, nor in Europe, but the controversy raised by that book —or by the one who refuted it—or rather the noise made about this controversy, gave to it such a "social radiation" that it apparently became "necessary" to give "an opportunity" to the exercise of the teaching office, such as to render that exercise "almost inevitable."

And so it became manifest, not only that there is no l nger any "Americanism" in America, but that there never was any!

Never yet have the most solemn decisions of the Church had any such effect.

Unfortunately for the friends of peace who would end the quarrel by a *jeu d'esprit*, there are persons excellently posted on American matters who hold a diametrically opposite opinion. Cardinal Satolli, f. i., the former Delegate Apostolic to the U. S., some time ago sent us a public letter, in which he qualified "Americanism" as a "pest infesting both hemispheres" (Questa funestissima atmosfera nei due mondi contagiosa.) True, Cardinal Satolli—like Msgr. Ireland and Keane and many other "Americanists"—is not a native American, but the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation of Studies is therefore no less an authority on the movement of ideas in both

*) The article was condemned by the Bishop of Nancy.

the old and new world, and his judgment is favorable neither to "Americanism" nor to those that deny its existence or danger.

There are also Americans born in America who see eye to eye with us on the subject. The editor of THE REVIEW applauded our efforts "in the name of thousands of American priests and laymen who abominate 'Americanism.'" From Iowa and Illinois, from San Francisco, Cleveland, New York, and Chicago, we received unequivocal testimonials of the sympathy with which American priests and lay Catholics seconded the campaign against "Americanism."

But what need is there to insist on this point after the solemn act by which the bishops of the New York province have proclaimed, in truly magnificent terms, their adhesion to the letter of the Holy Father?

Msgr. Corrigan, in the name of his suffragans and in his own, thanked the Pope for having issued that luminous document.

> With what wisdom, such are his words, has your Holiness succeeded in gathering together into one bunch the numerous fallacies and errors which tried to pass for good and Catholic doctrines under the specious title of "Americanism".... We can say that the monster which, to obtain lodgment, aye citizenship, among us, usurped the fair name of "Americanism," has died almost abornin'.

Thus "Americanism," denounced as a "pest" by Cardinal Satolli, is called a "monster" by the Archbishop of New York. And, assuredly, for the bishops of that province, the danger was no chimera; for they state:

> If your Holiness had not come to our assistance in such due season by your admirable letter, how many, through ignorance rather than malice, would have fallen into the snare. Vainly might the bishops have tried to shield their flocks from error. The error would have gradually gained a stronger foothold, and we should have been pointed out and accused of not being Americans. Meanwhile the false Americanism, also called by other similar names, which have had a long life, to the detriment of souls, for centuries among other nations, would have quietly taken possession among us, heaping conquest upon conquest in enormous proportions according to time and place. For this reason we are heartily glad that, thanks to your infallible magisterium, we do not have to leave to our successors the ungrateful task of fighting an enemy perhaps not yet dead.

We do not think that, in the face of such solemn testimony, given by the bishops of a whole province, and in particular by him who has in his archiepiscopal city the mother-house of the Paulists, any one will be bold enough to deny the existence of the evil and pretend that "Americanism is unknown in America." Whoso would sustain such a thesis must, no doubt, belong to that class of partisans who threw into the face of Catholics and faithful bishops the accusation of being enemies of their country.

We find, indeed, an allusion to this in the letter of the Archbishop of New York. It is as it were a cry of deliverance sent up to the Holy Father by the conservative bishops of the U. S., when he writes:

> Now we can proudly repeat that we, too, are Americans as well as the rest. Aye, we are Americans, and we glory in the title. We glory in it, because our nation is great in its institutions and enterprises, great in its development and activity; but in matters of religion, doctrine, discipline, morals, Christian perfection, our glory is in entirely following the Holy See. *)

We have here a beautiful profession of religious and patriotic faith, emanating from men whom "Americanism" persecuted and pretended to treat as strangers in their own country. This noble and bold language makes us understand all the better the levity and injustice of writers who in their oft-repeated praises for the American episcopate constantly pass over in silence the illustrious Archbishop of New York. Is it not worthy of one of the great bishops of the fifth century, this passage in his letter to Leo XIII.:

> And we, whom the Holy Ghost has placed as bishops to rule the Church of God, under the infallible guidance of your Holiness, hasten to offer and to manifest to you our sentiments of admiration and unbounded

*) By a very singular mistake, that never was corrected, the letter of Archbishop Corrigan was attributed by the Havas News Agency to Cardinal Gibbons, and most of the papers reproduced only this last-quoted passage. The answer of Cardinal Gibbons to the Holy Father has never been made public.

adhesion. We receive and accept absolutely, for ourselves, for our clergy, for the religious and the congregations that coöperate with us in the salvation of souls, and for all our faithful people, the doctrinal letter of your Holiness, Testem benevolentiae. We accept it and make it our own, word for word, sentence for sentence, in the same and identical sense in which, according to the tradition and wisdom of ancient Christianity, your Holiness intends it and wants it understood by all. We do not make, and shall never permit any one directly or indirectly depending on us to make, any reserve or tergiversation.

We shall not reproduce all the other letters of adhesion addressed by the bishops of the U. S. to the Holy Father in reply to the Brief Testem benevolentiae. They were all printed in full at the time in The Review. Let us only quote a few significant passages.

Msgr. Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans, who has just rendered such important service to the Church as Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and the Philippines, thanked his Holiness for having "so opportunely and happily pointed out and suppressed the errors designated by the name of Americanism."

In a similar strain wrote Archbishop Elder:

> The errors you therein condemn were calculated to work great harm to souls. Your Apostolic letter, with its lucid explanation of Catholic truth, will, we feel confident, end all future misunderstanding.

It ought to do so, and it is hard to understand how the new biographer of Father Hecker can dodge all these solemn episcopal declarations.

There is another point. Msgr. Horstmann, Bishop of Cleveland, one of the six signers of the Cincinnati letter, wrote to the *Catholic Universe* of Cleveland, under date of May 24th, 1899:

> The errors condemned by the Holy Father are certainly contained in the 'Life of Father Hecker.' To assert that the Pope condemned those errors without full knowledge and examination of the original English work, is simply absurd. To say that the condemnation was not opportune and not applicable to our country, is worse; it is disrespect towards the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

We shall add nothing to this episcopal pronouncement which closes the debate on the whole subject.

On the 8th of September of the same year, 1899, Leo XIII. addressed to the French clergy an encyclical destined to repress the errors and excesses of "continental Americanism." More recently still the joint pastoral letter of the bishops of England, confirmed and praised by the Holy Father, applied to Anglo-Saxon Liberalism the needed remedy. Thus the Church distributes to all the nations of the earth the word of life, and combats error under whatever form it may hide, according to times and countries.

As in France no one dared to say that the errors condemned in the Encyclical of Sept. 8th, 1899, did not exist among us; as the Catholics of England listened without protest to the warning of their bishops; so we hope that hereafter no American Catholic will be found saying that the "Americanism" condemned by Leo XIII. does not exist in the United States, or that the 'Life of Father Hecker,' withdrawn and disowned by its authors, does not contain the doctrines repudiated and condemned by the Apostolic letter to Cardinal Gibbons.

Charles Maignen.

Paris, 3 Rue de Dantzig.

Subjects of the Day.

Protestant Proselytizing in Italy.

The Protestant attempts at "converting" Catholic Italy are less conspicuous by the number of converts they make than by lavish expenditure of money. In 1871, there were in all Italy 20,000 Protestants; in 1891, 50,000, including the many Protestant foreigners who have settled in the larger cities.

Before 1848 there were but a few villages of Waldenses, the sect founded by Petrus Waldus in the XIII. century. When, in 1848, Piedmont began to lead Italian Liberalism, these Waldenses were induced to open a mission in Turin for the conversion of Catholics. Fostered and favored by the government, they gradually extended their work. Thus we find them at work in the former kingdom of Naples after the conquest in 1860. However, there came a split in their own camp. The Waldenses who had adopted a part of the Calvinistic confession of Geneva, were not radical and not Italian enough for some of the new converts. An apostate priest, by the name of Desanctis, headed the schism and found a powerful ally in the ex-Barnabite Gavazzi. Gavazzi accompanied Garibaldi as army-chaplain and everywhere sought to incite the masses against the Pope and the Catholic religion.

These apostates, together with the Protestant preachers and the Freemasons, kept up the agitation for the conquest of Rome, hoping the downfall of the spiritual from the fall of the temporal power.

On Sept. 20th, 1870, Rome opened its gates to all Protestant sects. Shortly before, however, a new split had occurred between the members of "the Free Italian Church" under Gavazzi and Desanctis, on account of infant baptism and the ordination of preachers, that led to a bitter fight among themselves. Soon American and English Baptists and Methodists made their appearance in Rome. Everywhere they sought to establish churches and schools, and spared no money to coax the Catholic youth into them.

Thus there is in the Via XX. Settembre the church and college of the Episcopal Methodists, an imposing edifice. Opposite the residence of the Cardinal-Vicar the Wesleyan Methodists have erected a large meeting-house. In the centre of the city, on the Via Nazionale, the Waldenses have their mission. The most active of all sects seems to be the "Chiesa Cristiana," which has rented stores or other suitable rooms all over town and opened them up as "sale Cristiane." If the public does not come of its own accord, money is used to fetch it. A great many scamps take advantage of the rivalry and discord between the sects to obtain money. As long as the Wesleyans, f. i., pay such a "profesh" well, he is fonnd at their meetings; but if his allowance is cut down, he presents himself to the Baptists as a Catholic ready to join the Baptists, etc. This propaganda is carried on not only in Rome, but even in the remotest country villages. Everywhere tracts and bibles are distributed, halls rented for divine service, etc.

Considering the immense amount of money thus spent, the results for Protestantism are practically nil. The Italians are Catholics. If they fall away, they do not become Protestants but rather infidels. Well, the Devil is satisfied with that.—J. F. M.

A Courageous Bishop.

Concerning the late students' riots in the City of Mexico we read in *El Tiempo* of July 5th:

> The serene attitude of the Archbishop in presence of the great scandal provoked by rancorous malice, is the effect of a wise prudence, yet it has been interpreted by many persons, — friends of violence,—as due to the haughty indifference of pride. Some periodicals have exhausted their whole stock of invectives upon the venerable prelate.... And what is it, they ask of his Grace?

A quick and fulminant condemnation without proper enquiry and examination of the proofs, of an accused priest, because an erratic public opinion denounces him for committing certain punishable acts. Haste in such a case might cause irreparable damage. Even civil justice always assumes the attitude of clemency, when it begins a criminal trial and holds the accused innocent until his guilt is proven. Shall an ecclesiastical tribunal without investigation of the alleged facts sent off like a snap of the guillotine a sentence of punishment upon the head of an inculpated priest?

And because the Archbishop proceeds with proper caution in that thorny investigation, he is called obstinate and proud, and accused of trying to shield one of his favorites. Only a rancorous mind can give such a twist to the careful investigation that has begun. But they go even farther. To the moderation and fortitude of the Church authorities they attribute the principal cause of last Sunday's rioting by the students. Public indignation, aroused by so much forbearance shown to the execrable criminal, they say, called forth an explosion. Thus the disorders in the streets, the profanation of the churches, are laid at the door of the ecclesiastical authorities, unwilling to satisfy the general demand for justice.

It is the old, old story of the wolf and the lamb. Happy the priests that have a bishop courageous enough to uphold the cause of justice even against a mob. Undue haste has ruined many a priestly life and more than one priest has been summarily dealt with simply on the strength of newspaper accusations.—J. F. M.

Much Loot and no Ethics.

One Protestant missionary to China, the Rev. Gilbert Reid, frankly defends in the current *Forum* the looting practised by the foreign troops and foreign civilians in Tientsin and Pekin. His article is called "The Ethics of Loot," but it turns out on reading to be much loot and no ethics. He speaks of "the romantic system of looting," and says that "the matter of loot is only one of high ethics," and, anyhow, quite "a minor consideration," being, in his mind, only a poetic way of punishing the Chinese for having "dared to defy the world and insult mankind." The attitude of this herald of the gospel of forgiveness is revealed in his calm statement: "Personally, I regret that the guilty suffered so little at my hands" (suffered, i. e., by being looted). Clearly, there is no great amount of ethics, high or low, about this, but Mr. Reid seems to be laboring under the singular delusion that the laws of war countenance such looting as he sympathetically describes. Loot, he says, means only the lawful spoils of war. "If there has been no war, looting may be set down as wrong." But does not Mr. Reid know that looting is forbidden by the modern rules of war? Has he never heard of the principle laid down by international law that "the property, movable as well as immovable, of private persons in an invaded country is to remain uninjured"? Even what the army requires for its own subsistence can be taken only by "authorized persons at a fair value." But the indiscriminate plundering which Mr. Reid tells about with so much gusto, has not been heard of in civilized warfare since the time of the first Napoleon. Protestant missionaries are, of course, entitled to set all the world right in matters of theology, but when they begin to talk about the laws of war, it would be well for them first to ascertain what these are.

WITH OUR EXCHANGES.

This is the impression the late Buffalo Saengerfest made on the Keltic editor of the *Catholic Union and Times* (see issue of July 4th):

TEUTONIC ROAR.

Last week broke the record for music in Buffalo—and the nation. All the German musical societies of the country were here ; ate their sausages and drank their beer in musical numbers ; and the few not too fat even joined in the merry-go-round of the Strauss waltz. Think of three thousand five hundred voices soaring to the empyrean! No wonder the welkin rang and that little feathered songsters, as they listened, flew off affrighted. 'Twas as the rush and roar of many waters. The Goddess of Music looked amazed at the marvelous proceeding ; but when she essayed to express her felicitations in the Teuton's tongue the poor lady dislocated her jaw ; and we fear she is doomed to a facial bandage for months to come.

We are almost tempted to wish there would be a continuous "Teutonic roar" about the sanctum of the *Union and Times.* With an occasional injection of "Preussic acid" this would make the dull old sheet spicy all the year round.

We read in the London *Tablet* (No. 3188):

Mr. Robert Collier, the editor *Collier's Weekly*, is one of the many prominent Americans now on a visit to London. Mr. Collier, who is a sort of Napoleon of the New York press, is an old pupil of the Jesuits. If Catholic journalism in America offers no scope for talents and capital so great as his, the general world of newspapers is the gainer. That is the thought which has often to occur to us in connection with the alienation of Catholic capacities—or at least their annexation by outside organisations.

Mr. Collier, of whose Catholic training we never yet had an inkling, is certainly not built of the stuff that made a Veuillot, a McMaster, and a Brownson great as journalistic champions of Catholicism, or he would have found a better outlet for his exuberant vivacity than a morally indifferent and more or less sensational picture-sheet like *Collier's Weekly.* His ability and capital, invested in a great Catholic daily, would have brought him less money perhaps, but surely more real glory and credit in the Book of Life.

We read in the Syracuse *Catholic Sun* (No. 2):

We have received the current issue of *Benziger's Magazine*, published monthly in New York by that well known church supply firm. We have no hesitancy in saying that it leads by long odds every Catholic publication in the country, both in matter and form.

What a disappointment to us of THE REVIEW who, not receiving *Benziger's Magazine*, had accorded the first place among all American Catholic publications to the peerless *Sun* whose brilliant rays scintillate from Syracuse!

The *Sun* man, by the way, has not yet learned to write the name of the bishop of the neighboring Diocese of Rochester correctly. He says that—

Bishop McQuade is an example to all Catholics in the matter of standing up for his rights as a Catholic citizen. He has a worthy second in our own bishop of Syracuse. It was such men who brought Bismarck to time in Germany, and his like in France, Italy, and England.

With all due respect to Bishops McQuaid and Ludden, we doubt whether the future historian will subscribe to this exaggerated estimate of a contemporary sycophant.

On May 15th Catholics in Europe celebrated the tenth anniversary of the encyclical of Leo XIII. on the social question, "Rerum novarum." The *Paradiesesfrüchte* (No. 7) expresses a mild degree of surprise that not one of our "great" Socialist leaders among the Catholic clergy took any notice of it. "Per-

haps," adds our contemporary, "the encyclical is in their eyes already out of date."

The "Christian Socialism" of the McGradys & Co. is not based on the doctrine of "the Social Pope." It is not Catholic at all.

The *Western Watchman* (July 7th), is in sore distress to find a meaning for the expression "verbis sollennibus," in a university degree. "Translate that if you can," rants the *W. W.* tragedian in his exit. What a fine clear field the *Watchman* would be for University Extension!

ARTHUR PREUSS.

NOTES AND REMARKS.

A special despatch from Hartford, Conn., to the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* (July 9th) says that State Insurance Commissioner Scofield has made public the exhaustive report, thirty-three typewritten pages, of the examination made jointly by actuaries of the Illinois and Connecticut insurance departments of the accounts of the endowment rank, Knights of Pythias. It discloses that the rank met with serious losses under its present management by various investments. It was also discovered that for many years the rank, in reporting its cash on hand to insurance departments, returned an amount which did not exist in fact, and there were actual overdrafts and a balance against it. In May, 1901, instead of a surplus of $225,807, there was a deficiency of $225,267.

The *Catholic Transcript* (No. 3) prints a diocesan chronology of the Diocese of Hartford for 1900, compiled by the Rev. James H. O'Donnell of Watertown. It is a plain record of facts; the filling-in process has been left for future pens. Father O'Donnell says by way of introduction:

> The Diocesan Chronology herewith presented has been compiled for the benefit of the future historian of the diocese. While facts are recent and the memory of them is still fresh, it seems to be good policy to place them on permanent record. Dates and names of individuals and of places stand a better chance of being correctly recorded than if, after a lapse of years, the historian is obliged to trust to the memory of men, even though actors in the events to be recorded.

We hope Father O'Donnell will continue the good work and find imitators in every diocese in the land.

Father O'Donnell is an accurate and painstaking historian, and we would advise the editor of the *Catholic Transcript* to submit to him for verification any items of ecclesiastical history before printing or reproducing them in his journal. The columns of the *Transcript* would not then be disfigured by such paragraphs as the following, clipped from the same number in which the Diocesan Chronology appears:

> Vicar-General Kelly, of the Catholic diocese of Georgia, made the following statement while in a reminiscent mood: "The first Christian baptism in America took place at about the site of Macon, Ga., in 1504. This may seem a strange statement, but it is true. Accompanying the expedition of Hernando de Soto, who made his memorable tour of discovery through this portion of America, was a Dominican priest, and the records show that two Indians were baptized by him in this portion of the country. From the description given, I am satisfied that the baptism occurred at about where the city of Macon now stands."—Atlanta (Ga.) *Constitution*.

In the first place, there is no Catholic Diocese of Georgia. All of the State of Georgia is comprised by the Diocese of Savannah, whose Vicar-General, according to the Catholic Directory for 1901, is V. Rev. L. F. X. Bazin.

In the second place, the statement itself, no matter who is authority for it, is a jumble.

Hernando de Soto was born about the year

1496 and did not land in Florida until 1539. There were in his expedition, according to Shea (I, 112), no less than twelve priests, eight ecclesiastics, and four religious, most of whom perished in the long and ghastly march from Tampa Bay to Pensacola, then to the Savannah and the land of the Cherokees, thence to Mobile, then to the Northwest and the Mississippi.

It is not improbable that the missionaries in de Soto's company baptized some Indian children, and possibly there is a record of such baptisms at Macon, Ga.

On the other hand, it is a historical fact that already Panfilo de Narvaez had with him on his expedition in 1527, which ended so disastrously, several secular priests and five Franciscan friars, with Father Juan Xuarez as commissary. They all landed in Florida, at what is now Tampa Bay, on Good Friday 1528, and most of them, including all the Fathers, perished, about the first of November, on Mal Hado, "the Isle of Misfortune," somewhere west of the mouth of the Mississippi.

This expedition aimed at a point beyond the limits of our Republic, and was only by accident cast on our shores. Shea says that in Cabeza de Vaca's vague narrative there is no mention of the celebration of the holy sacrifice by the priests after they landed, nor of any labors such as we may infer they undertook to solace their comrades in life or death; and we suppose there is no mention either of their baptizing any Indians on their weary way. Yet it seems probable that they did. To baptize and convert the natives was one of the chief purposes of all the early Spanish pioneering.

The Rev. W. F. Dougherty, pastor of St. Vincent de Paul's at Syracuse, N. Y., took occasion the other Sunday, according to the *Catholic Sun* (No. 2), to call the attention of parents to "the abominable practice of sending their children for beer, vulgarly called 'rushing the growler,' while they are yet scarcely beyond the age of reason. He advised them to abstain from such a practice, and that if they needed such a commodity to go for it themselves and that it was nobody's business but theirs if they drank such stuff."

The saloons of Syracuse must be regular dens of hellish iniquity if a good Christian father can not safely send his boy to the next one around the corner for a pitcher of beer.

The Rev. Dougherty ought to exert his zeal in the sanctum of the *Catholic Sun*, which does not blush to print this among its editorial notes of the same issue:

> A certain bishop took occasion once to rebuke one of his priests in the presence of his brother priests in regard to the matter of taking superabundant potations from the flowing bowl. The priest replied that he was "called to the vineyard of the Lord, and not to the pump-house."

The Virginia Constitutional Convention has before it for action a proposition to cut out the word "Christian" from the bill of rights. It will then read that "religion," not the "Christian religion," is the duty we owe to our Creator, etc. "Therefore all men," it is added, "are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience." The author of this proposed amendment says: "I am unwilling that our fundamental law should contain a single word which to a large class of our citizens has a sectarian meaning."

In the review of Fr. Klauder's Catechism, on page 253, last issue, there is a misprint which makes one sentence unintelligible. It reads: "One farmer is pleased with one variety, another *prepare* another." For "prepare" read "*prefers*."

According to a despatch from Lincoln in last Friday's *Globe-Democrat*, the Nebraska Supreme Court gave a hard rap to those mutual insurance companies which claim superior attractiveness by reason of their limiting the liability of members to a certain amount.

According to the decision of the Court in the case of Morgan vs. the Hog Raisers' Mutual Insurance Company, this is something that can not be done. Morgan had a contract with the company limiting his liability. All other members held the same kind of a contract. An epidemic came along, and the amount of claims filed exceeded the assets by $13,000. The officers sought to collect this sum from the members, despite the fact that the limit had already been reached. Morgan resisted, and his suit was made a test case. The Court holds that Morgan is liable and must pay all assessments.

✱

A number of interesting articles, notes, and communications had to be held over for the next issue.

✱

The new brief of the Holy Father in favor of the Catholic University, to which we referred last week, was published on Saturday. It is addressed to Cardinal Gibbons and expresses gratification at the growth of the institution as well as hope that the number of its students may increase.

✱

In No. 14 of The Review (p. 220) we reproduced without comment a despatch of the Philadelphia *Record*, of June 13th, wherein it was stated, first, that Msgr. Ireland had been offered and had accepted the degree of LL. D. by Yale University; secondly, that Yale was founded by Congregationalists and that this is the first instance of a Protestant institution conferring a degree on a Catholic clergyman; thirdly, that Prof. George B. Adams recently taught in his class-room at Yale that in the Catholic Church there was one kind of preaching for ignorant and another for intelligent persons; fourthly, that Rev. Chas. W. Merriam, of Springfield, in his recent graduating address delivered at the Yale Divinity School, made a general attack upon Catholics.

Dr. M. J. Synnott, of Montclair, N. J., writes to The Review to say that these statements are in part false.

In June 1893 Harvard University conferred the honorary degree of LL. D. upon Archbishop Keane, at that time Rector of the Catholic University in Washington. In the same month and year Yale University conferred the honorary Degree of Master of Arts upon my own deceased brother, at that time Professor of Moral Theology in Seton Hall Seminary, South Orange, N. J.

In reply to the *Record* writer's criticism of Prof. Adams of Yale, I can say that from my personal knowledge of Prof. Adams during my own student days at Yale, I am convinced an injustice has been done him. I believe no one would deny the statements attributed to him more forcibly than Prof. Adams himself, did he know of their existence. He is uniformly fair and unbiased and in dealing with mediaeval history makes it apparent to all that he wishes to be absolutely impartial.

It would have been more satisfactory and effective had Dr. Synnott procured a positive denial from Professor Adams himself. If that gentleman valued his reputation, he would not let such allegations as that of the *Record* (which also appeared in a number of other papers) go unchallenged.

✱

A reader writes:

Anent your remarks relative to the desecration of the sanctuary of St. Mary's Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., allow me to state that the Rev. Rector of St. Malachy's Church, Chicago, Ill., only recently in contradistinction attempted to elevate the tone of the present-day stage by treating the members of St. Malachy's choir to an attendance at Power's Theatre when that excellent farce comedy "Are You A Mason?" was rendered. The title is indicative of the play. No fault could be found if a lay person attended a performance of so insipid a nature, but that a Catholic priest could find nothing more elevating for the supposedly most intellectual members of his congregation, is a sad commentary on his discriminating powers. However, his motive may have been of the highest. He may indeed have believed that the excellence of his choir, as regards morals, would inculcate in the actors, presenting this flatulent mediocrity, a higher ideal of art.—A. B. S.

The following paragraph, credited to the N. Y. *Times* literary supplement, has lately appeared in several papers:

> The publication in Berlin of the Greek text of Homer without the accents marked has more significance than the audacious editor imagined, who very likely was inspired by the sole idea of returning to the text of ancient Athens. It is now a generally admitted fact among the best authorities that what the modern instructor in Greek interprets as accents were originally placed over letters simply for the purpose of indicating stress. The attempt to do away with them is to be encouraged, not merely because the ancient Hellenes did not use them, but from the fact that, without the accents marked, Greek quotations may be printed from Greek types, while hitherto the alternative has been to use Latin characters or run the risk of having the printer bungle the quantity if you had not already sufficiently bungled it yourself.

It is true that the ancient Greeks did not use accents, but the reason for doing away with them at this late date, given in the last sentence of the above quotation, is puerile. Nothing facilitates the correct pronunciation of Greek and perception of quantity so much as the accents. The pronunciation of the Latin word *homines*, for instance, can be certainly known only to him who has learnt it; the Greek ἄνθρωποι is so clearly marked by its accent that there can be no doubt of its quantity.

The use of the Greek accents is not nearly as difficult as some believe; by a few simple rules we can master the pronunciation of all the diverse forms of every word in our vocabulary, which, without the accents, is an exceedingly difficult and wearisome task.

We hope the accents will not be done away with and can say that in Germany few scholars favor their complete abolition. The publication of the Homeric text without the accents is, as the *Times*' writer rightly supposes, inspired by the sole purpose of restoring the most ancient text.

Senator Chauncey M. Depew is quoted in a despatch in the Sunday papers as defining "typical American humor" as "the faculty of not stopping at the first aspect of things, but of discovering in them an unlooked-for element of ludicrousness."

We fail to see wherein American humor differs from the humor of other nations, unless it be by its disregard of the laws of decorum, in that it ridicules the unfortunate, the truly great and wise, or is employed on subjects that ought to be held sacred. As Mr. Depew says: "Certain American humorists would extract fun from a funeral."

True humor implies incongruity in the object, surprise in the effect, and in the humorist strong common sense and kindliness. Measured by this standard much of our so-called American humor (think of writers like Peck!) is not humor at all.

In his valuable series of papers in the *Pittsburg Catholic* on the early history of the Church in and around Pittsburg, our esteemed friend the Rev. A. A. Lambing (July 3rd) notes some interesting facts about the Catholic Directory. He says:

> Minor inaccuracies will necessarily be found in a work of this kind, but it is of great value to the religious annalist, especially the local historian. The first Directory was published in 1817, the next in 1822, and the third in 1833, from which time they have been issued yearly to the present day, with the exception of the years 1862 and 1863, when the necessary information could not be obtained on account of the war of the rebellion. I have a complete set of these, with the exception of the numbers for 1817, 1838, and 1847.

One of the stenographers at the Vatican Council, writing to the *Tablet* (No. 3188), à propos of the use of Latin in the Church, says a universal language is of little avail unless you have also a universal pronunciation of it. The French bishops, he says, were the despair of the Italian, and there were Irish bishops who might have spoken Chinese for all that the Spanish or Italians could follow of it. No one bishop could understand all his brethren said.

EDUCATIONAL TOPICS.

§ The N. Y. *Evening Post* (July 5th) is authority for the statement that the Seventh Day Adventists are preparing for a system of parochial schools. They have 2,000 churches to supply with teachers of their religious belief, and have sent out an appeal to the young members to prepare themselves for teaching. To advance the work, an educational conference and summer school will be held at Lake Gognac, near Battle Creek, Mich., from July 10th to September 3rd. A large attendance is expected, as tuition and tent-lodging will be free, and only $1.75 per week will be charged for board.

§ His Eminence, Cardinal Vaughan, in a recent pastoral letter, exhorts his people to continue their struggle for their rights in the matter of elementary education. At present the Catholic parochial schools are partially maintained by public monies; but the Cardinal contends that the whole cost of their maintenance should be defrayed by the State, and that the money should be drawn from the Imperial Exchequer rather than from the rates. "As to the management and public control," he says, "any reasonable measure will meet with our support, provided satisfactory guarantees be permanently secured for training the mind, heart, and character of our children under the direct influence of their holy religion."

A List of New Books.

[This list is published with the purpose of announcing important new publications of special interest to Catholic readers. B. Herder, 17 S. Broadway, St. Louis, Mo., supplies the list and has the books in stock.]

The Catholic Girl in the World. (Second Series.) By Whyte Avis. Net $1.00.

The Life of Mother Mary Baptist Russell, Sister of Mercy. By her brother Rev. Matthew Russell, S. J. Net 75 cts.

The Catholic Pulpit; Educator and Expositor. Vol. I. Net $1.60

The Eve of the Reformation. By Francis Aidan Gasquet, O. S. B. (New edition). Net $2.75.

The Holy Gospels. With Notes by the Vy. Rev. Canon McIntyre. Net 40 cts

Doris. A Story of Lourdes. Net 75 cts.

A Hidden Heroine. By Stella Hope. Net 50 cts.

Before Our Lord Came. An Old Testament History for young children. By Lady Amabel Kerr. Net 40 cts.

A Sketch of the Life and Sufferings of Bl. Sebastian Newdigate of the London Charterhouse. By Dom Bede Camm, O. S. B. Net $1.25.

Translation of the Psalms and Canticles, With Commentary. By James M'Swiney, S. J Net $3.

RELIGIOUS NOTES.

*** The *Catholic Sun* (July 5th) quotes a Congregational minister as saying to a priest:

> My dear sir, we talk about the ecclesiastical tyranny of Rome. Why, there is no domination so tyrannical in all the world as what we ministers suffer from the laymen of our churches. There is no man that is so hide bound by the trammels not only of a narrow public sentiment but by the openly expressed dictation from the pews as a minister is. It is only a fiction when it is said he is free to preach the gospel of Christ. Let him do so; let him enunciate the truth as he knows it, and he will be very soon asked to retire. If such a calamity happens he is without support, or even the necessities of life, till some other congregation chooses to call him.

While we would not call this "the vital weakness of Protestantism" (that lies deeper), like our contemporary, it is undoubtedly a reason which keeps really able men out of the ministry and leads so many a preacher to seek refuge in sensational topics of the day.

*** The Rev. William J. Donovan, of New York City, according to the *Union and Times* (July 4th), has brought an action in the Supreme Court to recover $50,000 damages for alleged libel from Michael H. Wiltzius and John La Boule, members of the firm of M. H. Wiltzius & Co., of Milwaukee, publishers of the "Catholic Directory." The alleged libelous words were: "Absent on leave, William J. Donovan." Plaintiff says that when these words are used regarding a priest, they are generally understood to mean by all priests and communicants of the Catholic Church that such priest is under ecclesiastical censure, without position and in disgrace with the authorities of the Church, and further that he has been guilty of such offences as immorality and drunkenness and is not fit to exercise the functions of a priest.

We of The Review have never so understood the phrase, "Absent on leave." Nor do we think they are generally so understood among Catholics.—A. P.

THE REVIEW PRINTS NO ADVERTISEMENTS.

ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
3 8151 001 32408 3

LIBRARY
ST. JOHN'S SEMINARY
BRIGHTON, MASS.